IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SMITH KLINE & FRENCH)	
LABORATORIES LIMITED and)	
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM)	
CORPORATION d/b/a)	
GLAXOSMITHKLINE,)	
Plaintiffs,) Civil Action No.	05-197-GMS
v.	,)	
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,)	
Defendant.	<i>)</i>))	

GLAXOSMITHKLINE'S REPLY TO TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS

Plaintiffs Smith Kline & French Laboratories Limited and SmithKline Beecham Corporation, doing business as GlaxoSmithKline, (hereinafter collectively "GSK"), respond to the Answer and Counterclaims by Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (hereinafter "Teva USA") as follows:

COUNTERCLAIMS

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 1. Counterclaim Paragraph 1 does not contain allegations of fact requiring an answer from GSK. To the extent that an answer is deemed required, GSK admits that Teva USA's Counterclaims purport to arise pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. Except as expressly admitted, GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 1.
- 2. Counterclaim Paragraph 2 does not contain allegations of fact requiring a response from GSK. To the extent that a response is deemed required, GSK admits that this

Court would have jurisdiction over proper claims of the kind alleged by Teva USA pursuant to Title 35 U.S.C. and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Except as expressly admitted, GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 2.

- 3. Counterclaim Paragraph 3 does not contain allegations of fact requiring a response from GSK. To the extent that a response is deemed required, GSK admits that venue would be proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 for proper claims of the kind alleged by Teva USA. Except as expressly admitted, GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 3.
- 4. GSK admits that a justiciable controversy exists between the parties hereto with respect to validity and infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 4,452,808 and 4,824,860. Except as expressly admitted, GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 4.

Acts Giving Rise to this Action

- 5. GSK admits the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 5, but clarifies that NDA No. 20-658 was originally submitted by SmithKline Beecham, an unincorporated division of SmithKline Beecham Corporation, which now does business as GlaxoSmithKline.
- 6. GSK admits the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 6, but clarifies that the '808 patent is assigned on its face to SmithKline Beckman Corporation, which subsequently changed its name to SmithKline Beecham Corporation and now does business as GlaxoSmithKline. GSK further clarifies that the '860 patent is assigned on its face to Smith Kline & French Laboratories Limited, which now does business as GlaxoSmithKline.
 - 7. GSK admits the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 7.

First Counterclaim

- 9. GSK repeats and reasserts all responses to Counterclaim Paragraphs 1 through 8 as if they were stated in full herein.
 - 10. GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 10.

Second Counterclaim

- 11. GSK repeats and reasserts all responses to Counterclaim Paragraphs 1 through 10 as if they were stated in full herein.
 - 12. GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 12.

Third Counterclaim

- 13. GSK repeats and reasserts all responses to Counterclaim Paragraphs 1 through 12 as if they were stated in full herein.
 - 14. GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 14.

Fourth Counterclaim

- 15. GSK repeats and reasserts all responses to Counterclaim Paragraphs 1 through 14 as if they were stated in full herein.
 - 16. GSK denies the allegations set forth in Counterclaim Paragraph 16.

Prayer for Relief

GSK denies that Teva USA is entitled to any relief whatsoever, either as contained in Teva USA's Answer and Counterclaims or otherwise.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Smink Rogowski (Del ID No. 2632)
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
The Nemours Building, 1107 North Orange Street

The Nemours Building, 1107 North Orange Street Wilmington, DE 19801

Phone: (302) 658-9141 Fax: (302) 658-5614

Attorney for Plaintiffs
Smith Kline & French Laboratories Limited and
SmithKline Beecham Corporation, d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline

Of Counsel:

William F. Lee, Esq. WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109 Phone: (617) 526-6000

Fax: (617) 526-5000

William G. McElwain, Esq.
Henry N. Wixon, Esq.
Amy K. Wigmore, Esq.
Mark Rienzi, Esq.
WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING,
HALE AND DORR LLP
The Willard Office Building
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Phone: (202) 942-8400 Fax: (202) 942-8484

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Dated: May 16, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Document 7

I, Patricia Smink Rogowski, hereby certify that on May 16, 2005, I electronically

filed GLAXOSMITHKLINE'S REPLY TO TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA,

INC.'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS using CM/ECF which will send

notification of such filing to the following:

Josy W. Ingersoll, Esq. Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor LLP 1000 West Street, 17th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801

I hereby certify that on May 16, 2005, I have served the document by facsimile and by first class mail to the following non-registered participants:

> Stephen D. Dove, Esq. Steven A. Engel, Esq. Karen M. Robinson, Esq. Kirkland & Ellis LLP 655 Fifteenth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-5793

William F. Lee, Esq. Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109

William G. McElwain, Esq. Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP The Willard Office Building 1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20004

Patricia Smink Rogowski (#2632)

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP The Nemours Building 1007 N. Orange Street Wilmington, DE 19801 (302) 658-9141 progowski@cblh.com